Due to the unfortunate recent events of daesh enslaving the Yazidis, I wanted to address Islamic slavery and its purpose. An example of a way to look at slavery is that if I robbed a bank, I would spend ten years in jail. If the US judicial system knew I was going to keep robbing banks, why should they let me go free? That is what happens in religion. Haven't we all met someone who responded with "I'm not listening to you" when you give them genuine advice? This was the Jews reasoning during the unification of Arabia. The slaves during Muhammad's time were far different than slaves in the 1800's. At the end of the day, they could keep their Jewish beliefs and be a slave for life. I had to address this first because each time period is different. This is a justification for slavery or to put it in better context in hopes of fixing your understanding of historical context. This will also describe how it failed.

Before we get into any of the controversy regarding slaves, I will address my theory on why slavery exists. We cannot kill women and children in war, and we are meant to take the men as prisoners, if we can't kill them in war what do you do? They lost the war, and I can't release the men and children, they will grow up to fight me again someday this is a fact since they are in an ideology and not a religion if it were a religion I could see myself releasing them since they wouldn't try for a peace treaty of some kind. The slaves now need protectors because it explicitly states do not kill the women and children. The whole goal of Islam is peace same with other religions, slavery is a solution to the problem set. We know for a fact that the alternative was tribes in Africa, so this is what they were given to make countries were Islamic Caliphates. Now, I have to be mature to give this proper justice; the female slaves were not rape victims because you are forbidden to rape. I personally do not want female slaves, people need to think on this, that is more work as a man. It sounds great on paper, but it isn't. You also have to pay for a slave's health. It was meant as a nice gesture for hard work, get over it people for the slave it could be the ultimate reward to know their guardian who they knew for 18 years had their full support or it could be that they were both too attached to each other which are understandable. One could read it as "don't be upset if it occurs, be honest" after all, his wife will want to know why it happened. It is not for the slave to get pregnant, that would mean that you would have to marry her, and your wife would not want that. It's not if I agree or disagree with it. This is not if you would do it, it is "right or wrong" in eyes of Islam. Whether I would do it or not is so irrelevant because Muhammad and Aisha freed as many slaves as possible. Muhammad even adopted one of the

slaves as his own. I read it as "your opinion is not requested here." You had to look after the slave after all. At that time, slaves made total sense to expand the empire. The slave owner had to look over the kids, so the slave owner was the parent, that's not bad at all. At least the child would have someone to look over them, protect them, and have a male to teach the male child to be a leader. You had to treat the slave kid as your own even if the kid was not yours. So you are asking me "slave" or "orphan", I respond with what difference does the title make for the less fortunate individual? How about "guardian" or "no guardian", "work" or "no work"? After all, I would have to take the young adult out of the orphanage to come to live with me so I don't have to drive to pick the kid up from the orphanage, I'm certainly not going to that extent just to give the kid work. In the Quran, you are requested in three verses to be kind to the slave. This means you are asked to implement laws against the abuse of slaves, so if you can't abuse slaves you cannot act like others should serve you. If you are to free the slave, you are given the title of Companion of the Right. I have no clue the terms for freeing slaves; I assume it is in your best judgment when the slave was ready. In terms of economics, it could or could not be wise I can't say but slavery was clearly about helping others after all the slaves could request a contract that the officials in each Empire would deem reasonable or not. Slavery was commonplace during the 1800's; people weren't bummed out or angry when slavery ended. Many slaves went into peasantry in Russia after Peter Emperor of all Russia outlawed it in 1732, one could argue it was a bad trade off. As far as selling slaves in order to break up families, if you read the Quran and you sold a slave and broke up a family from it or handed them over to someone who was bad, then you should have not been given the right to slaves in the first place, no one can read a Quran front and back and do something horrific like that. No and I'm done addressing this, just know that I would beat you up if you ever did that. The intent was holy, though that Christian slave woman may not like being a slave; her child could become a Muslim and would love life. The woman along with the child could not be sold. If the slave master died, both the woman and the child would be set free. Allah always kept people safe, regardless of if the slave master did not see the value in the slave and his own child, it all worked itself out. The master could not sell a female slave he had sex with; this is more proof that slavery was in the best interest of the slave on top of the fact that the slaves were not compelled to prostitution. All the Abrahamic faiths are the same, but it was unheard of in Christianity to watch a girl get undressed in front of people and bought her despite the fact an auctioning to me does not make sense. In all faiths, this

is allowed. You can also buy her solely for sex whereas in Judaism it was an option since she has urges. You would think these three faiths are separate, but they aren't for introducing this common practice in Islam. In Judaism, there were laws against having sex with one that is promised to another man. In Christianity slavery is debated; also, because in Christianity a man could "only" have one wife, it wasn't allowed so to speak. In Islam we are told that we can have sex with female slaves and multiple wives. I don't have a source, but only in Islam was it a market for such a practice, Islam introduced this.

Was it a bad thing that the Ottoman Empire threatened to enslave all Europeans until they converted to Sunni Islam? This was a reality at the time. I don't ever view it in this regard because they fought for Sunni Islam, I will never fault someone for doing what they thought was right, they were thinking long term so were the Christians. If someone were to bring up slavery, I would mention how the Ottoman Empire ended slavery because of Sunni Islam to help improve their empire, not for their image or for humanitarian reasons; slavery never was cost efficient because you had to pay for each slave's healthcare.

The Ottoman Empire had failed at it because they had to look over the slaves costing them more than they were taking in. The Ottoman Empire slavery was done as a market which is not what it was intended for in fact it was the opposite; these people didn't know any better you want to give them trouble fine but not around me you won't when you make far more on average than these people ever did. They almost got it right because the slaves were taxed, that is a good thing because it is regulated but nowhere near the extent it needed to be regulated for it to work. Before the 19th century only around 10% of the population could read or write, I could not go around and explain what they were doing was wrong. You could not impose a religious decree; they would not listen. Just think, how is this any different from someone getting a lease on a car they cannot afford? The difference being that this was done throughout the whole empire instead of 7% of the population. It was tolerated and the kid would not get upset, but they didn't understand why not do it. The girl should also be looking for a husband, not you the slave owner, there would be new slaves to take her place. It would not bother me at all if I met someone at that time that had sex with his female slaves even if he had kids, I would still be friends with him. The point is that these are humans, not gold. If you really wanted it to work then you would have to start treating them like humans, this is no different than a video game where you upgrade your character. By 1850, it

was banned. Each generation is a bit different. Some can do slavery correct, others can't that's why it got corrupted, it got out of hand there was no "slave authority" to tell you not to buy slaves for sexual purposes I don't even know why I typed that it sounds so goofy. "You bought a slave for sexual purposes? You spent all that money just to sleep with her? That's what her slave owner wanted, now she is going to be lazy and make you do all of the farming, she will sleep with you to get you to buy her new jewelry." Also, if the slaves were freed from slavery from a neighboring country, they would then sell their slave owners into slavery, this was out of respect. I am now so against reparations because the once slaves would then pick up the same set of ethics that their slave owners used on them. Somehow, they can teach you that slavery was unethical in school, but they cannot teach you that we don't want wars in America.

Cuba will not allow people to leave the country. It would benefit the Cuban people if a leader installed an Empire in Cuba helping them expand if that is what it took to make the people there free. It's about doing the right thing. The war would only be done if the ends justifies the means because Castro would have generations of millions of people enslaved for his own gain, if he changed very soon which he won't then we won't have to start a war with 5 million Cubans dead. 5 million in the future would have to be saved and I'm sure his government will be around for another 100 years unfortunately. It may only require us to take a small part of the cost of the island to save the innocent Cubans. Slaves were encouraged to buy their freedom and were encouraged too in the Quran, what does that say about what Castro is doing?

What people overlook is that back in 1820 there were no bosses or CEO's. The land you owned was your land, if there was a company it was no bigger than 10 employees, the only case I can think of is a printing press. Once the industrial revolution happened, there was no reason for slaves, everyone had a boss now. What sense would it make if there was a boss, then there was the employee, and then the employee told slave what to do? The boss would get mad at the employee for instructing a slave on how to act and the boss wants the most production he can get out of the employees, it's the boss who decides your work schedule, not the slave owner. If this were the case, the boss wouldn't take the slaves because no boss will let you have your own set of rules. Not only that, but they also want the slave to work their way up, if they thought the slave owner was mistreating the slave, then they would fire the employee. If you want a different viewpoint as to why slavery is gone, it isn't professional in today's

earth nor is it regulated which countries we could have them in, a portion of the earth would have to be in favor of it. Also, the laws for freedom would not be sorted out since a slave could be bought in Libya and would be flown back to America, America would have to sort out the paperwork for the slave’s freedom since Libya would not follow where its non-citizens are.

Give everyone a clean slate; it is unjust for a child to pay reparations for slavery that happened 150 years ago. The child did not collect a paycheck for someone else's labor. If we kept shaming people, it would lead us into communism, and we know for a fact that communism where the state runs everything is not the best system possible. I don't owe people a dime. If only these same people knew that blacks who bought their freedom and the native Americans became part of the America like any other citizen. If people are wondering why they didn't hold office, I would say that it was because they looked up to White Americans at that time, they thought that the White Americans knew more than them because the blacks and native Americans had only so many years’ worth of knowledge and the people they were voting for either were lawyers and were studying their whole lives or could do a better job than them speaking to the public. They went along with others saying "lawyers are smartest" because that was all they knew, and they loved their country. I know there was never an instance at a town hall when someone would say "shut up you native American, we don't request your opinion", these people wanted more voices contributing to America after all; they wanted every perspective they could get which is not at all like today. Just look at their parties, they had Democrat-Republican. The reason for slavery in America was again for religious reasons. They were bought from black slave owners from Africa. The majorities of slaves in Africa were black and owned by Arab Muslims, none of it matters. People of all skin colors treated slaves well, people will enslave their own race regardless of which the majority is. The mistake people of today make is that white people were and are to this day oppressive this couldn't be further from the truth, segregation did not affect wealth. Now many Arab countries will treat you terribly because of your wealth there are plenty of documentaries on it and how the FIFA World Cup location is being built by slaves from India. When reporting rape, they will not hear you, also slaves get treated awful. The truth is they want more money, as if it isn't enough that minorities get scholarships for their skin color. Being against illegal immigration, aren't all countries against it? If the minorities wanted a separate country; that is fine. What throws me off though is that the rich stay rich, and the poor stay poor, it is all who you know; skin color has

nothing to do with it. Please don't buy that someone's heritage makes them an innocent victim or that they would stand up for "justice", they would do the same thing. It always has to do with skin color. Native Americans were savages who couldn't read or write this is fact.

Here is how I will address Colonialism- it did a lot of good for people by giving them a country to work with, it ended slavery in Africa and many fighters wanted independence for South Africa in the Boer Wars to also help the blacks there in a way of forming their own empire that would be held office also by black people. If not for Christians, there is no Industrial Revolution, they were also experts at trade and finance, they discovered that the lower the taxation, the better. Every country was colonialist in some way at that time even if by peaceful means, they would have kept expanding and buying land. I know Hindu India wasn't Colonialist at that time but be aware that if the people who claimed to be Jews were in it, they would have run the country like they did for Germany up until the end of WWI, these people were smart merchants. It didn't matter anyways; India wanted to be unified and embraced the British, so there was no way to talk them out of being colonized which they had embraced. They were simply outsmarted; you could never call my country "East India Company." They also went along with Britain; I am unsure how many troops they got but they had fought in the wars. It is fact that they wanted to be unified, so reparations there are pointless, now they speak English, and they prefer one English language. The point I'm trying to make is that the foreigners would show up to a country and would then do trade with the African tribes. The way it was operated was that the British would convince the Africans to fight on their behalf after they saw how the British running their country worked in their financial favor, there was no need to force covert or move people out of their lands. The Africans wanted to hear about Christianity because the British troops were explaining who they were fight on behalf of. There is just no grudge to give on behalf of both the British troops and Christianity, their means were legitimate, they felt they were doing what was best. I obviously agree with the Christianity part the same with Islam though many ancestors were slaves and that may upset someone, all I am saying is "don't be mad at the early followers because of it". I'm not mad at all at the Ottoman Empire for making Christians slaves, today we have employees, but we know not to sleep with our bosses for a raise in salary. The whole goal of me explaining this to you is to strengthen your belief in Islam. The point being that your ancestors were not educated enough, that's just how it was I don't say that to insult them I'm sure they were good

people. Were there war crimes? Yes, but nowhere near the scale you think existed.

Unethical work treatment of the Chinese through hard labor was unacceptable. As my professor taught me, it will hurt empires in the end by making its citizens lives so easy at the expense of others. This allows for the citizens to be invaded by neighboring countries who far outwork them, if word got out to France that the British could be conquered, they would have invaded in no time. Here's the thing, you are only making these Chinese people at the time want to rebel against you. If you cared about them enough to give them workers' rights, they would support you overtime. Russia got it, they knew that they could run China, but it was too late. Had the Chinese have been treated well; they could have converted to Christianity and unified with Russia.